

## **EPA Housatonic River Citizens Coordinating Council (CCC)**

Pittsfield Athenaeum  
One Wendell Avenue  
Pittsfield, MA

April 4, 2012  
5:30-7:30pm

### **Meeting Summary**

**Participants:** The list of participants is attached.

#### **Introduction**

Patrick Field, facilitator, Consensus Building Institute (CBI), opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda. CCC members and members of the audience introduced themselves.

A CCC member said they had decided to sit in the audience, rather than at the table, until a Connecticut sub-committee meeting was scheduled.

The facilitator asked whether CCC members had additions or corrections to the September meeting summary. There were no comments on the summary, so it was approved.

#### **Updates**

##### **Overall Status**

Dean Tagliaferro, U.S. EPA, provided an update on the overall project status. He projected a color-coded map of the area covered by the consent decree (all presentation slides are available at: <http://www.epa.gov/region1/ge/publiceventsandmeetings.html>), with map colors indicating the status of the 20 areas where GE is required to conduct remediation. The 16 areas in green are areas where remediation is complete, GE has submitted a final completion report, and EPA has approved that report. Areas in red indicate that remediation is complete and GE is in the process of submitting its completion report. Areas in blue – Unkamet Brook and Silver Lake – are the main areas that still need to be remediated.

CCC members had the following questions and comments (replies are in italics):

- The word “complete” means that a project is complete with regard to the consent decree requirements, but it does not indicate complete eradication of PCBs in the area.
- Once a parcel is complete and EPA has approved GE’s final completion report, is GE held harmless for future problems, even if there is considerable contamination left in the ground, groundwater and/or plume? *When EPA approves a final completion report, it means that EPA agrees that GE has done the work required by the Consent Decree and has met performance standards. It does not mean that GE will be held harmless or is released*

*from all future responsibility. GE retains responsibility for long-term monitoring on these properties. Also, if there are situations that require additional work – for example due to new information or a previously unknown condition, that indicates that the remedy is not protective of human health and the environment – with very few exceptions EPA can require GE to do this work in order to ensure the cleanup protects human health. [Consent Decree, Paragraphs 162-165]. There is no time limit on this responsibility, as the Consent Decree is in perpetuity.*

- Has EPA ever required additional work after a remediation project was completed? *Yes, there have been situations in which EPA has required additional work after a remediation project has been completed.*
- How does the hold-harmless issue work in situations where we know that PCBs have been left behind, and/or current PCB levels are determined to be unsafe in the future? *This would be a situation in which new information showed that PCBs are more harmful than EPA previously thought. So, EPA could reopen the consent decree, as long as the information was both relevant and reliable to support the determination that more work was required. [Consent Decree, Para. 42]*
- Is it possible to require some kind of “insurance policy” (e.g. an escrow account or performance bond) to ensure that GE could pay for any additional work required in the future? *In the Decree, GE must submit its annual financial reports to EPA. If EPA believes the financial situation of GE has changed such that we need additional financial assurance, EPA can require this. The consent decree did not require additional assurances because when it was initiated, EPA believed that GE had sufficient resources to carry out the cleanup. [Consent Decree, Section XVII: Assurance of Ability to Complete Work]*

#### Demolition and Monitoring at the Grossman Building

Dean provided an update on the Grossman Building. The building, which was part owned by GE and part owned by a private individual, was on a consent decree property. It was demolished in December and January by GE and the City of Pittsfield; although demolition was not covered by the consent decree, they made sure that contaminated soil was not removed from the property. Although EPA was not directly involved in the demolition, it has remained apprised of the situation.

CCC members had the following questions and comments (replies are in italics):

- Is monitoring at the Grossman Building covered under the consent decree? *Yes, soil left on the property and groundwater beneath the building will be monitored into the foreseeable future.*
- How often is monitoring done? *Each groundwater well has a different frequency assigned to it – some are monitored monthly, some semi-annually, and some annually.*
- Are there any notifications required before utilities or others carry out street work? *Most utilities are familiar with the situation and know to contact GE if they will be working near groundwater.*

- Since pumping has been done on both sides of the street, can we assume there is contamination under the street as well? *There is a floating oil (LNAPL) plume in this area. It is much reduced from what it used to be, but we monitor periodically detect NAPL so there is likely residual oil staining in the soil below the street.*
- What is the fate of the PCBs in the plume? *GE has been actively removing oil from groundwater through extraction wells for 25-30 years. They collect the oil and send it to an off-site incinerator.*
- Does the amount of oil being removed from the plume roughly correlate with the reduction in the plume? *We have not done a robust analysis of this since removal began, but we do know that the plume is shrinking.*

### Silver Lake

Dave Dickerson, U.S. EPA, provided an update on Silver Lake. He projected a slide to highlight sediment and soil removal areas (in red and green respectively). Approximately 12,000 yards of sediment and soil will be removed. Most of the sediment to be removed is shoreline sediment in order to fit the cap into the lake without reducing its footprint. There will be tree and shrub clearing around the lake perimeter so that removal equipment can get on site, but this vegetation will be replanted. There will also be road closings as needed to get heavy equipment to the site; there will be signage when this happens, and it will be kept to a minimum as much as possible. The work schedule has been delayed due to a performance issue with the contractor GE was planning to use; hopefully work will begin within two or three months.

Dave showed a second slide showing a cross-section of what the cap will be made of. He noted that the armor stone is designed to protect the cap from waves. It is likely that there will be a turbid quality to the lake water as the cap is being placed; any cloudiness observed will be due to the materials in the cap, not contamination.

Dave showed a slide depicting the walking path and replanting plan, and explained that the walking path will only go around the Silver Lake Boulevard portion of the lake. On the private areas, plantings will be developed with parcel owners. For public areas, the plan is to plant shorter trees and plants in areas where plantings could impact the WMECO solar plant, and taller trees in areas further away from the solar facility.

CCC members had the following questions and comments (replies are in italics):

- What is the area on the slide that is shaded but is neither red nor green? *It is a wetland peninsula. It will be capped and replanted as wetland habitat.*
- Is the sediment removal being done because of a high concentration of PCBs, or to get cap to fit? *It is being done for both reasons. In some areas there is a high concentration of PCBs, so sediment needs to be removed. Approximately 400 cubic yards of sediment need to be removed from the most contaminated area. In other areas, sediment needs to be removed so that the cap can fit in the lake without reducing its perimeter.*

- What is the highest level of contamination in the most contaminated area? *It is quite high, in the tens of thousands of parts per million. EPA will get back to the CCC with exact numbers. [Editor's Note: Figure 6-2 of the August 2011 Silver Lake Work Plan presents sampling data in this area, with the highest reported value of 36,000 ppm one to three feet below the sediment surface.]*
- Where will the removed sediment and soil go? *It will be disposed of off-site. Exactly where it goes depends on the characterization of the waste material, but none of it will be disposed in Berkshire County.*
- There is a pond on the PEDAs site that has PCBs and drains into Silver Lake. Doesn't that mean it will keep depositing PCBs into Silver Lake even though the lake is capped? *Yes. This outfall is regulated under EPA's permit program. We are in the process of reissuing a permit to PEDAs, which will hopefully reduce the outfall of PCBs into the lake – it is not clear when the permit will be issued, but hopefully it will be done this year. EPA can follow up on this.*
- What is the permitting agency for the ancillary pool outside of Silver Lake? *EPA and DEP jointly issue the permit to PEDAs, the landowner. This is done under the NPDES program as part of the Clean Water Act. GE formerly had a permit to discharge into the lake, and when PEDAs assumed ownership of the land they began operating under GE's permit. EPA's permit office is working on issuing a renewal of that permit, as requested by PEDAs; once there is a proposed permit, it will be open for public comment. EPA will let CCC members know when the comment period is open. In the meantime, the terms of the old permit are still in effect.*
- Is there a way to assess how well the cap is working versus what the outfall brings in? *This distinction will likely be useful in the future. There is a requirement to monitor the quality of the cap after it is installed, to test for contamination. The additional deposition on top of the cap will also be monitored, as will the surface water. If any issues arise, follow up work is required to investigate the source of recontamination. GE does monthly monitoring of the outfall; we will take the suggestion of monitoring the inflow into advisement.*
- Are there other inflows into the lake? *There are many storm drains that flow into the lake, but they are generally not from contaminated areas. There is one pipe from former GE land, which is subject to an industrial [NDPES] permit. The others are regular city storm water discharges, which are under general storm water permits – there is no requirement that these be tested for PCBs, so they are generally not tested.*
- Silver Lake seems like a good candidate for adaptive management, especially given issues around contamination coming into the lake through the outfall.
- GE workers used to pump water from Silver Lake at night, for use during the day. Was the infrastructure used for that ever tested for contamination? *Water was pumped for fire prevention at Springside Park. The structure, which is under state jurisdiction, was found a few years ago. GE, in cooperation with EPA, entered the structure and emptied it. GE stated they believed there was minimal material at the bottom of the structure, which was scraped off and sampled – it was essentially clean. An action item is to provide CCC members with a report on the investigation process and findings. [Note: this issue was discussed at the following CCC meetings: June 13, 2007, September 19, 2007, and June 23, 2008. The meeting notes are on EPA's Web Site. In addition, GE submitted a report on this topic to*

MassDEP on April 1, 2008 titled Former Water Reservoir, Springside Park – Investigation Report]

- Given the materials being used for the cap, isn't it possible that people can dump things in Silver Lake or otherwise engage in behavior that could damage the cap? *The cap is made of sand and a topsoil-like material that won't break down over time – this is the protective part of the cap. The geotextile used on the lake perimeter is primarily there to avoid mixing soil cap material with the underlying sediment. While it is possible that someone could compromise the cap somehow, there will be an inspection, monitoring and maintenance program in place to catch and fix any problems that arise. If there is a breach, testing will be done to see how much contamination, if any, escaped.*
- What is the depth of the cap and the thickness of the armor stone? *In the main area of Silver Lake, the cap will be at least 14 inches thick. Around the edges of the lake, where the geotextile is used, the cap will be 10 inches thick. On the east side of the lake, the armor stone is thicker because it is downwind – it is approximately 12 inches thick, and the average size of the stone is 5 inches. On the west side, it is approximately 6 inches thick, and the average size of the stone is 3 inches.*
- Who will be monitoring the cap and who will be overseeing this monitoring after the cap is installed? Will the public be able to comment on the monitoring plan? *GE will do the monitoring, with oversight from EPA. The post-capping monitoring process is not finalized yet – this will be done when the post-completion report is done. In the meantime, there is a proposed monitoring plan in the current work plan that the public could comment on, as an input for the final monitoring plan.*
- Was the Consent Decree changed with regard to tree planting, to prevent taller trees from shading the solar farm? *Not yet, but this is expected to happen. The Consent Decree has a specific requirement for GE to plant tall trees around the north side of Silver Lake. However, these trees could get in the way of WMECO's solar plant. So, GE, WMECO, PEDDA, the Trustees and DEP have been discussing the possibility of modifying the consent decree so that the trees are allowed to be shorter. Everything points to this happening, but before it is finalized we need to wait for the land transfer between WMECO and PEDDA to happen. There is no precise timetable for when the consent decree will be modified. Note that EPA's website has a summary of all Consent Decree modifications from the last 12 years.*
- Will there be follow-on monitoring for plants? If so, who will conduct that monitoring and who will oversee it? *GE will conduct this monitoring, with oversight from EPA and the Trustees, since the Silver Lake Boulevard side is part of the Trustees project. The timeframe is seven years, and monitoring will be done around survivability, invasive species, and herbaceous cover.*
- Will the outfall into the river be regulated? *The outfall itself will have a number of structures and booms around it, which can be regulated with stop logs as needed. There is a turbidity action level above which the project will have to be stopped and evaluated.*
- The Silver Lake walkway should be connected to the pedestrian areas that MassDOT is planning – has EPA been in touch with MassDOT to ensure this opportunity is not missed? *EPA has kept MassDOT up to date about the project status. The MassDOT project involves an extensive rework of East Street from Merrill Road to Lyman Street, and they are also*

*planning to reconfigure the entryway into Silver Lake. The goal could be to extend the sidewalk to the walking path around the lake.*

- Recent studies have shown that volatilization and inhalation are primary pathways to PCB exposure. What is in place for air monitoring and education for neighbors? *Most of the materials will be underwater, but there will be continuous air monitoring for both airborne PCBs and particulates. There will also be controls for how materials are managed once they are removed.*

Tim Conway, EPA, explained that there is an opportunity for public comment on a proposed modification to the prospective purchaser agreement between EPA and PEDa. Prospective purchase agreements enable people to acquire property without acquiring liability for it. A few years ago, the City of Pittsfield entered into one of these agreements so that PEDa could acquire 52 acres of property from GE for redevelopment purposes without becoming liable for contamination there. Recently, they have discussed expanding this area, so that PEDa can acquire 3 acres on the north and east side of Silver Lake from private property owners, to support redevelopment and facilitate walkway construction. The agreement has been sent out for public comment, and comments are due to EPA on or before April 16<sup>th</sup>. The EPA website has additional information on how to submit comments.

A CCC member requested that the agenda be amended to allow time to discuss the rest of river process and other issues of highest importance to the CCC, and to schedule a follow-up CCC meeting to cover issues for which there was not enough time. The CCC agreed to discuss the rest of river process next, and to cover other issues as time allowed.

### Rest of River Update

Jim Murphy, EPA, provided a brief update on the rest of river process. EPA and agencies from Massachusetts and Connecticut are still bringing discussions to a close. Once discussions are complete, the plan is to hold two special CCC meetings – one in Massachusetts and one in Connecticut – to provide information, receive input and answer questions. CBI will work with the CCC to schedule those follow-up meetings. At that point, the proposed plan will not yet be outlined in detail; details will be built into the proposed plan in the months to follow. Jim thanked CCC members for their patience, and acknowledged that many people are frustrated at not being involved in the process.

CCC members had the following questions and comments (replies are in italics):

- Who is participating in the rest of river meetings? *Participants have included: Jan Czechtoka (CT DEEP), Bob Cianciarulo (EPA), Tim Conway (EPA), Mike Gorski (MassDEP), Mary Griffin (MA Department of Fish and Game), Ken Kimmell (MassDEP), Rich Lehan (MA DFG), Tracy Iott (CT DEEP), Paul Locke (MassDEP), Macky McCleary (CT DEEP), Jim Murphy (EPA), Jeff Mickelson (MassDEP), John Regosin (MA Division of Fisheries and Wildlife), Jack Looney (CT Attorney General's office), Curt Spalding (EPA), Susan Svirsky (EPA), Dean Tagliaferro (EPA), Mark Tisa (MA Division of Fisheries and Wildlife), Eva Tor (MassDEP), Betsey Wingfield (CT DEEP), David Foulis (MassDEP) and John Ziegler (MassDEP). Others participating included:*

*Betsy Southerland (EPA), Dave Charters (EPA), Jim Owens (EPA), Ira Leighton (EPA), Larry Brill (EPA); and Lori DiBella (CT AG). Not everyone has attended all meetings – some have been part of sub-workgroups, and some have only attended larger technical meetings.*

- How much detail can we expect to receive at the follow-up meetings? How specifically are you dealing with the issues? *We are dealing with issues very specifically, so we are looking at a lot of details. These will be included in the final suggestions for how to move forward, but it is hard to say how specific our first report will be.*
- How soon after the special meetings will you provide recommendations for the rest of river? *We are hoping for a June-July timeframe for the release of the proposed plan. At that point, there will be an opportunity for public comment on our proposals, and we will schedule additional public meetings to provide more information and answer questions.*
- Several CCC members expressed strong concerns about the lack of transparency of the inter-agency meetings, and frustration at being excluded from the process until the 60-day public comment period. CCC members requested information including dates and times of inter-agency meetings and cost and expenditure figures. *The agencies understand that people are frustrated, but don't have further information to provide tonight. Agency staff is keeping costs associated with these meetings to a minimum. We are committed to telling people what has been discussed at the meetings.*
- Holding meetings among agencies with shared responsibility for the river, and then holding follow-up public meetings in Massachusetts and Connecticut, seems reasonable. Ultimately, the process will translate into a document with the information the CCC is seeking, and we will have the time necessary to review and comment on it. But people are running out of patience with this process, so the agencies need to finish up quickly.

### CT Fish and Tissue Study

Susan Peterson, CT DEEP, provided an overview of the most recent CT Fish and Aquatic Insect study. This monitoring work is done by GE, with the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences, and predates the Consent Decree – it is something Connecticut initiated with GE independently in the 1970s. In 1990, CT DEP entered into a cooperative agreement with GE to monitor fish and aquatic insects, and study them for PCB levels. The most recent cooperative agreement with GE ended in 2004. Since at that point we were already well into the Consent Decree process and talking about the rest of river, GE preferred to continue doing monitoring voluntarily rather than signing another formal agreement. Reports are released every other year; the most recent one was received in the fall of 2011, and is available on EPA's website.

The monitoring process targets specific species, which are selected in cooperation with GE, the CT Department of Public Health, and the CT DEEP Fisheries Division. DEEP shares the report findings with the CT Department of Public Health and the Fisheries Department, and they use it to develop fish consumption advisories for the CT portion of the Housatonic River. In recent years contamination levels have declined, but fish remain unsafe for unlimited consumption so there is still an advisory in place. The next monitoring year will be 2012, so DEEP is talking now with GE about continuing the voluntary monitoring partnership.

CCC members had the following questions and comments (replies are in italics):

- Are the fish advisories being updated in light of the most recent report? *The CT Department of Public Health will determine that, but most likely the fish advisories will not change.*
- What is the possibility of increasing fish advisory signage around the river and its tributaries? *We can try to open discussion with the Fisheries Department about putting signage in places we're worried about. The report probably won't affect what existing signs actually say, and some tributaries are already listed for consumption advisories.*
- Some impacted fish, including pike and bottom feeding fish, are not included in advisories – DEEP needs to list those. DEEP should also look into higher contamination being found in fish and insects in Lake Zoar. *Ongoing monitoring is extremely important for ensuring that we know what is going on and what is coming downstream. Some bottom feeding fish are listed, including eels and catfish. We add additional species as we can, in partnership with GE and the Public Health Department – let us know which specific species should be added. Until we can decrease the amount of PCBs traveling down to Connecticut, we will keep consumption advisories in effect as interim measure.*
- Why is carp no longer being sampled and tested? *Carp was tested at some point and placed on the advisory.*
- DEEP should be a stronger voice in raising the profile of contamination in Connecticut, for example by pressuring EPA to better characterize the degree of contamination.
- Can the data in the report be simplified, so that it is more accessible to more people?
- Which insects are being tested, and why? *We are primarily looking at insects in shallower parts of river, where we can collect them. Insects are early detectors of PCBs - they accumulate mass in their bodies and then are eaten by fish and others, so looking them is helpful for monitoring PCBs. The study's focus is on measuring PCBs in aquatic insects; it is not really a community study.*
- Are any mammals or birds being tested as part of monitoring or other studies? *Connecticut does not test any mammals. There was limited testing of one type of bird as part of a larger state study, but otherwise we are mostly looking at what is in the river and what is consuming food from the river. In Massachusetts, testing has been done on mink, small mammals, soil invertebrates, tree swallows, fish, and two types of frogs – there are reams of data available on these studies. A study was also done by EPA in 1999 on ducks, and they were found to be highly contaminated with PCBs. Note that birds migrate, so contamination found in them could come from elsewhere.*

### **Public Comment Period**

Members of the public had the following questions and comments (replies are in italics):

- As part of the rest of river process, are there any plans to straighten the river north of Wood's Pond? *This could be brought into the discussions between agencies, but it is not something we have heard anyone raise.*

### **Administrative Matters**



## Email Lists

The facilitator noted that CBI had circulated a proposed procedure for handling email lists moving forward, including a request for a few CCC members to help update and maintain contact lists. These CCC members will review the email lists in the near future and then once or twice per year moving forward, keeping contact information confidential. Dennis Regan and Tim Gray volunteered to assist with this task; the next step is for CBI to follow up with them to begin the review process.

## Scheduling Special CCC Meetings

The facilitator explained that as soon as possible, CBI would circulate dates and venues for follow up meetings on the rest of river process in Connecticut and Massachusetts. CCC members confirmed that Wednesday evenings are still generally the best day for CCC meetings.

## **General Updates**

A CCC member informed the group of an event on April 5<sup>th</sup> in Lenox on PCBs and Wildlife. The event will include panel discussions and Q&A with two experts on PCBs and wildlife.

A CCC member informed the group of a free event on May 5<sup>th</sup> at Cornwall Public Library, which is off of Route 4 in Connecticut. The event is being sponsored by HRI, HEAL and other river organizations, and will include a showing of “Good Things to Life: GE, PCBs and Our Town.” The event will include a book signing and a river art show. Doors open a 6:30pm.

A CCC member requested that in the future, when EPA and others present project updates, that they give a brief overview of each site for new members of the audience who may not be familiar with the area.

The facilitator noted that the agenda items that were not discussed during the meeting would be moved to the next meeting.

**Adjourn: 7:40 pm**

## **Action Items**

| <b>Action Item</b>  | <b>Who</b> |
|---|------------|
| Provide more information about contamination levels in the most contaminated areas of Silver Lake. Completed; see above.                      | EPA        |
| Follow up on when the new permit might be issued to PEDAs for the outfall into Silver Lake  | EPA        |
| Provide CCC members with a report on the investigation into pumping to Springside Park, including information about the process and findings. | MA DEP     |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Follow up with Dennis Regan and Tim Gray regarding review of email lists.<br>Note: conference call to review/revise email lists took place on 5/29/12 with Jane Winn, Dennis Regan, Betsy Fierman, Jim Murphy | CBI |
| Set and circulate dates and venues for special CCC meetings in Connecticut and Massachusetts on the rest of river process   | CBI |

**EPA Housatonic Project Citizens Coordinating Council**  
**Attendance April 4, 2012**

| <b>Name</b>         | <b>Organization</b>                                  | <b>Attended</b> |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|
| Valerie Andersen    | Housatonic Clean River Coalition                     | X               |
| Thelma Barzottini   | Citizens for PCB Removal                             | X               |
| Michael Carroll     | General Electric                                     | X               |
| Gene Chague         | Berkshire League of Sportsmen                        | X               |
| Barbara Cianfarini  | Citizens for PCB Removal                             | X               |
| Jeff Cook           | Downtown Pittsfield                                  | X               |
| Shep Evans          | Housatonic Valley Association                        | X               |
| Sarah Flynn         | Housatonic Clean River Coalition                     |                 |
| Lynn Fowler         | Housatonic River Commission                          | X               |
| Benno Friedman      | Sheffield  | X               |
| Dave Gibbs          | Citizens for PBC Removal                             | X               |
| Tim Gray            | Housatonic River Initiative                          | X               |
| Judy Herkimer       | Housatonic Environmental Action League               | X               |
| Nat Karns           | Berkshire Regional Planning Commission               | X               |
| Charles Kilson      | Schaghticoke Tribal Nation                           |                 |
| René Laubach        | MA Audubon   | X               |
| Andrew Madden       | MA Dept. for Fish & Wildlife                         | X               |
| Dan McGuinness      | NW CT Council of Governments                         |                 |
| Caleb Mitchell      | City of Pittsfield                                   | X               |
| Karen Pelto         | MA Natural Resources Trustees                        | X               |
| Susan Peterson      | CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection | X               |
| Dennis Regan        | Housatonic Valley Association                        | X               |
| Andy Silfer         | General Electric                                     | X               |
| Mike Supranowicz    | Berkshire Chamber of Commerce                        | X               |
| Susan Svirsky       | U.S. EPA   | X               |
| Dean Tagliaferro    | U.S. EPA   | X               |
| Cory Thurston       | Pittsfield Economic Development Agency (PEDA)        |                 |
| Eleanor Tillinghast | Green Berkshire                                      |                 |
| Eva Tor             | MA Department of Environmental Protection            | X               |
| Sherry White        | Mohican Nation                                       |                 |
| Jane Winn           | Berkshire Environmental Action Team                  | X               |
| John Ziegler        | MA Department of Environmental Protection            | X               |
|                     |  |                 |
| <b>Alternates</b>   |  |                 |
| Jerry Burke         | Berkshire Chamber of Commerce                        |                 |
| Audrey Cole         | HEAL   |                 |
| Tim Conway          | U.S. EPA   | X               |

|                    |  |   |
|--------------------|--|---|
| Alison Dixon       | HVA                                    |   |
| Lauren L. Gaherty  | Berkshire Regional Planning Commission |   |
| Richard Gates      | General Electric                       | X |
| Mark Jester        | Berkshire County League of Sportsmen   | X |
| Dave Martindale    | HRI                                    | X |
| Kevin Mooney       | General Electric                       | X |
| Jim Murphy         | U.S. EPA                               | X |
| Tom Potter         | MA Natural Resources Trustees          |   |
| Gayle Tardif-Raser | Mass Audubon                           |   |
| Bruce Winn         | Berkshire Environmental Action Team    | X |
| George S. Wislocki | Green Berkshire                        | X |

### ***Additional Attendees***

| <b>Name</b>        | <b>Organization / Affiliation</b>        |
|--------------------|--|
| Mike Argue         | Weston Solutions                         |
| Yvonne Borsody     | Pittsfield Resident                      |
| Matt Calacone      | General Electric                         |
| Scott Campbell     | Weston Solutions                         |
| David Charters     | U.S. EPA                                 |
| Stuart A. Chase    | One Berkshire                            |
| Bob Cianciarulo    | U.S. EPA                                 |
| Charlie Cianfarini | Citizens for PCB Removal                 |
| Dave Dickerson     | U.S. EPA                                 |
| Patrick Field      | Consensus Building Institute             |
| Elizabeth Fierman  | Consensus Building Institute             |
| Richard Fisher     | U.S. EPA                                 |
| Kim Herkimer       | HEAL                                     |
| Kristen Hewitt     | Occupy Berkshires                        |
| John Irvine        | Lane Construction                        |
| William Jobin      | Colorado Valley Ecologists               |
| Trevor Jones       | Berkshire Eagle                          |
| Kalin Jordan       | Scott Laugenour for State Representative |
| Kathy Kessler      |  |
| Pam Malumphy       | One Berkshire                            |
| James McGrath      | City of Pittsfield                       |
| Rod McLaren        |  |
| Ed Mertzluft       | Ward 4 Rest of River Watch               |
| Joyce Mertzluft    | Resident                                 |
| Mark Miller        | Pittsfield Resident                      |
| Ernie Moynihan     | Pittsfield Resident                      |
| Ken Munney         | U.S. FWS                                 |
| Dori Sausbury      | General Electric                         |

|                  |                      |
|------------------|----------------------|
| Will Singleton   | King Street Resident |
| Liz Sorenson     |                      |
| Shira Stenberg   | U.S. EPA             |
| Jaclyn Stevenson | Lenox Resident       |
| Brian Vanover    |                      |
| George Valli     | Ward 4 Resident      |
| Mary Wendling    |                      |
| Ritchie Wilson   |                      |